

- 7 -

Serial No. 10/038,074

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13864

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated August 27, 2003. By way of this amendment, claims 1, 4, 7, 10, 12 and 14 have been amended. Claims 2, 3 and 24 have been canceled without prejudice. The specification has been amended to supplement the written description. Support for the amendment to the specification can be found in the drawings, particularly Figure 1. Claims 1 and 4-23 are currently pending in the application. Applicant hereby requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 7, 12, 14 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent 60-64737 (JP '737). The Examiner has rejected claims 4-6, 8, 9, 13, 15-19 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over JP '737. These grounds of rejection are respectfully traversed in light of the present amendment.

Independent claim 1 recites a system for correcting twist in airfoil components which includes a first fixture assembly for holding a first end of a airfoil component, a rotary drive unit for rotating the first fixture assembly about an axis, and a second fixture assembly for holding a second end of the airfoil component. The second fixture assembly is aligned with the axis about which the first fixture assembly rotates.

Independent claim 14 recites a system for correcting twist in airfoil components which includes a lower fixture assembly for holding a first end of an airfoil component mounted on a horizontal plate, a rotary drive unit for rotating the lower fixture assembly, and a carriage slidingly mounted on a vertical plate. An upper fixture assembly for holding a second end of the airfoil component is mounted on the carriage directly above the lower fixture assembly.

JP '737 discloses a machine for twisting vanes. The Examiner contends that the machine includes a first fixture (labeled A by the Examiner) and

- 8 -

Serial No. 10/038,074

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13864

a second fixture (labeled B by the Examiner). From Figure 1, it appears that the second fixture includes a vertical arm 2 having a vertically moving carriage 3 and a horizontally moving carriage 4. A gripper 7 is shown mounted on the horizontally moving carriage 4. As described in the English language abstract, the gripper 7 grips a vane 10 and is rotated to twist the vane 10. The vane 10 is one of a number of vanes that extend radially out from a disc part 11, which is part of a "work" 9. The first fixture is shown as being mounted on a horizontal plate and apparently rotates the "work" 9 about a vertically extending axis.

Applicant respectfully submits that JP '737 fails to show the claim 1 limitation of a second fixture assembly being aligned with the axis about which the first fixture assembly rotates. Instead, as clearly shown in Figure 1 of JP '737, the second fixture assembly B is displaced laterally with respect to the vertically extending rotational axis defined by the first fixture assembly A. The second fixture assembly B is thus not aligned with the rotational axis of the first fixture assembly A. Furthermore, the first fixture assembly A of JP '737 is located vertically below the rotational axis defined by the second fixture assembly B. As such, neither fixture assembly is aligned with the other.

For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that JP '737 does not anticipate claim 1 as amended.

Regarding independent claim 14, applicant respectfully submits that JP '737 fails to show a lower fixture assembly and an upper fixture assembly mounted on a carriage directly above the lower fixture assembly. The two fixture assemblies A and B of JP '737 are positioned side-by-side and are not disposed one over the other. Accordingly, JP '737 does not anticipate claim 14 as amended

*Not what
is claimed*

For the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 14 are allowable over JP '737. Claims 4-13 and 15-23 depend from claim 1 or 14 and are thus also believed to be allowable.

- 9 -

Serial No. 10/038,074

Atty. Docket No. 13DV13864

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication that claims 10, 11, 20 and 21 would be allowable if rewritten to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. However, in view of the above remarks submitting that claims 1 and 14 as amended are allowable, it is felt that the rewriting of claims 10, 11, 20 and 21 is not necessary.

In view of the above, it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the objections and rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1 and 4-23 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

12/29/03

Date

Patrick R. Scanlon

Patrick R. Scanlon
Reg. No. 34,500
207-791-1276